

Reply to Office Action dated April 30, 2009

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 15-19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 40-41 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 6, 10, 15-18, 24, 26, 27, 40 and 41 are amended and claims 13, 14, 20, 21 and 28 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments may be made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8-10, 13-19, 21, 24, 26-30 and 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0024657 to Wright et al. (hereafter Wright) in view of JP 0621722 to Hayashi, U.S. Patent 6,757,837 to Platt, U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0137762 to Rother and newly-cited U.S. Patent 6,591,376 to VanRooven et al. (hereafter VanRooven). The Office Action also rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wright in view of Hayashi, Platt, Rother, VanRooven and U.S. Patent 6,542,897 to Lee. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a storing unit for storing proper information of the TV, and contact information of a certain site, the proper information including a model name or a model number of the TV. Independent claim 1 also recites a controlling unit for contacting the certain site by use of the contact information and transmitting the proper information to the certain site in response to a checkup key signal input by a user, for controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the TV received from the certain site, for receiving an error list of TV function from the certain site for determining an error in TV function that occurred in the TV, and for receiving an error restoring information for the error in TV function from the certain site and automatically restoring the error in TV

function by setting data or state of the TV regarding the error to a standard state based on the error restoring information.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action (on page 3) states that Wright discloses a storing unit (memory 200) for storing proper information of the product and the contact information of a certain site and a controlling unit (processor 202) for contacting the certain site and transmitting the proper information to the certain site, as well as displaying of information corresponding to function information and error checkup menu (help window 410, hypertext 406) of the product. The Office Action then asserts that Hayashi discloses storing proper information that is typically found on a label of a television in a storing unit at a time of manufacture, and wherein this proper information is read out of memory when the user enters a service mode. The Office Action (on page 4) then asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to employ the teachings of Wright into a television system (such as Hayashi), and thereby providing user updated, relevant information in a “service mode” related to a user’s specific product when a check up key is input.

The Office Action (page 4) acknowledges that “the [modified] system is silent on the step of receiving an error list at the controlling unit from the certain site...and the controlling unit automatically restores the error of the TV.” The Office Action then relies on Rother’s paragraphs [0021] and [0049] and Platt’s col. 4, lines 5-23 as allegedly addressing this deficiency of the modified system of Wright/Hayashi.

Reply to Office Action dated April 30, 2009

Rother relates to test and diagnosis systems for machines such as automotive vehicles.

Rother discloses providing a menu of symptoms in a screen display, so that a user/technician selects one or more of listed symptoms as determined from an interview with the vehicle owner. Rother further discloses that, based on the selected symptom or symptoms, a display screen 39 displays a list 42 of possible causes of the symptom or symptoms selected and a counterpart list of test procedures to be performed to check for those causes. See Rother's paragraphs [0024] and [0026].

Rother's system differs significantly from the claimed features in several aspects. Rother's system relates to test or diagnosis of a vehicle, and not to a television (TV). Further, Rother's system is merely a stand-alone testing device provided separately from the vehicle itself. Thus, control of displaying a menu of symptoms is carried out in a testing platform, and not in the vehicle under test. This differs significantly from independent claim 1 in which control of the error list is carried out by the controlling unit of the television itself. Additionally, because Rother's system is a separate testing platform and the vehicle can not provide any model information to the testing platform, Rother's system performs a time-consuming vehicle identification procedure by presenting a user/technician with a number of questions or fields, such as a model year, a make, a model name, an engine size, an engine code, a fuel type, an ignition type, an air measurement type, and/or the like, before carrying out the diagnosis. See Rother's paragraph [0023]. Still further, Rother's system does not receive a menu of symptoms from an external site, but has its own database of symptoms to access when displaying and the symptoms. See Rother's paragraph [0049] and FIG. 6, step 53.

Reply to Office Action dated April 30, 2009

Rother also does not receive any error list by itself, nor does the testing platform receive the error list from an external site through a network. Thus, it is clear that Rother does not teach or suggest a controlling unit for receiving an error list of TV function from the certain site for determining an error in TV function that occurred in the TV, as recited in independent claim 1. Platt, VanRooven and Lee, either alone or in combination, do not suggest the above deficiencies of Rother.

For at least these reasons, Wright, Hayashi, Platt, Rother, VanRooven and Lee do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites contacting the certain site by referencing the contact information and transmitting the proper information to the certain site when a checkup key signal is input by a user, receiving service menu information corresponding to the TV, the service menu information including an error checkup menu and a function information menu, and transmitting selection information according to a selection of the user from the service menu information. Independent claim 10 also recites that in case that the user selected the function information menu, receiving the selected information from the certain site to display on a screen of the TV, and in case that the user selected the error checkup menu, receiving an error list of TV function from the certain site for determining an error in TV function that occurred in the TV. Independent claim 10 also recites receiving an error restoring information for the error in TV function from the certain site and automatically setting data or state of the TV regarding

Reply to Office Action dated April 30, 2009

the error in TV function to a standard state based on the error restoring information, wherein the proper information includes a model name or a model number of the TV.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Wright, Hayashi, Platt, Rother, VanRooven and Lee do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 10. More specifically, Rother (and the other applied references) does not teach or suggest receiving an error list of the TV function from the certain site for determining an error in TV function that occurred in the TV in combination with receiving an error restoring information for the error in TV function from the certain site automatically setting data or state of the TV regarding the error in TV function to a standard state based on the error restoring information. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 27 recites a television storing unit for storing television information and contact information of an Internet site, and a television controlling unit for contacting the Internet site by use of the contact information and transmitting the television information to the Internet site in response to a checkup key signal input by a user, for transmitting error information of television function to the Internet site, for receiving an error list of television function for determining a television functional error that occurred in the television from the Internet site, and for receiving an error restoring information for the television functional error from the Internet site and automatically restoring the television function error.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Wright, Hayashi, Platt, Rother, VanRooven and Lee do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 27. More specifically, Rother does not teach or suggest for receiving an error list of television function for

determining a television functional error that occurred in the television from the Internet site, and for receiving an error restoring information for the television functional error from the Internet site and automatically restoring the television functional error. Thus, independent claim 27 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10 and 27 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 8-10, 15-19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 40-41 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **09/842,082**

Reply to Office Action dated April 30, 2009

Docket No. **P-0222**

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: September 30, 2009

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610